

Appl. No. 09/730,877
Amdt. Dated August 13, 2004
Reply to Office action of May 19, 2004
Attorney Docket No. P08915-US2
EUS/J/P/04-3189

REMARKS/ARGUMENTS

Claim Amendments

The Applicant has amended claims 1, 4-6, 12, 15-17, 22 and 23; claims 3 and 14 have been canceled. Applicant respectfully submits no new matter has been added. Accordingly, claims 1-2, 4-13 and 15-26 are pending in the application. Favorable reconsideration of the application is respectfully requested in view of the foregoing amendments and the following remarks.

Claim Rejections – 35 U.S.C. § 102(e)

Claims 1-4, 6-10, 12-15, 17-21 and 23-26 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102(e) as being anticipated by Sallberg (US 6,137,783 hereinafter Sallberg). The Applicant respectfully traverses the rejection of these claims. Claims 3 and 14 have been canceled rendering the rejection of these two claims moot. The limitations of claims 3 and 14 have been incorporated into their respective independent claims.

The Applicant has amended claims 1, 4-6, 12, 15-17, 22 and 23 to better define the intended scope of the claimed invention and to correct antecedent basis. The Examiner's consideration of the amended claims is respectfully requested.

The Applicant's present invention discloses a system for handover of a mobile terminal from an SGSN in a first network to an SGSN in a second network without interrupting packet transmission and control signaling. A temporary connection between networks is created and maintained until the state (context) of the connection in the first network is transferred to the second network. At the same time, the first SGSN redirects packet transmission and control signaling to/from the second SGSN (page 6, lines 7-15) until the second SGSN sends a context forward acknowledgment signal to the first SGSN. Payload traffic from the terminal is then communicated directly between the gateway SGN and the new SGSN without passing through the first SGSN. (page 12, lines 9-19)

The Applicant respectfully directs the Examiner's attention to amended claim 1.

Appl. No. 09/730,877
Amdt. Dated August 13, 2004
Reply to Office action of May 19, 2004
Attorney Docket No. P08915-US2
EUS/JJP/04-3189

1. (Currently amended) A method for handing over of a connection from a first serving GPRS support node (SGSN) to a second SGSN in response to an inter SGSN routing area update, the method comprising the steps of:
establishing a temporary leg between the first SGSN and the second SGSN;
responsive to the connection entering a standby state, operating the first SGSN as a temporary anchor in response to the inter SGSN routing area update
finishing up ongoing transactions prior to moving context from the first SGSN to the second SGSN; and
redirecting packet transmission and control signaling to and from the second SGSN via the first SGSN via the temporary leg while the first SGSN is operating as the temporary anchor. (emphasis added)

The Applicant respectfully submits that the Sallberg reference does not anticipate the present invention.

The Sallberg reference appears to disclose a system for reducing or eliminating the need to transfer mobility management information during temporary signal interferences in a satellite communications system in order to increase system performance. (Summary). Sallberg discloses an arrangement whereby a mobile terminal can switch from an old MPDS in one network to a new MPDS in another network but the mobility information remains temporarily with the first network rather than being transferred via satellite. The control transference takes place as usual via satellite, but a packet switch that interconnects the two networks transfers the mobility information. (Col. 2, Lines 45-51) The old MPDS acquires the new MPDS address and forwards data packets to the new MPDS. Additionally, a timer is started by the old MPDS and when the timer stops, the mobile terminal context is deleted. (Col. 8, L 30-35) After the mobility terminal context in the old MPDS is canceled, the old MPDS forwards forward data packets to the new MPDS. (Col. 8, L 30-33)

The Applicant's invention transfers data and control signals from the first SGSN to the second SGSN via the temporary leg - one path. In contrast, Sallberg transfers control signals via satellite and data signals directly between networks - two paths. This is necessary because the satellite link is either blocked or the mobile terminal out of the

Appl. No. 09/730,877
Amdt. Dated August 13, 2004
Reply to Office action of May 19, 2004
Attorney Docket No. P08915-US2
EUS/J/P/04-3189

satellite coverage area. Further, in the Applicant's invention operations on the first SGSN are allowed to "finish up" before shutting down and leaving the mobile terminal directly connected to the second SGSN. The emphasized limitations in claim 1 of the Applicant's present invention are not found in the Sallberg reference. The Applicant respectfully asserts that amended claim 1 is allowable over Sallberg and requests reconsideration and allowance of claim 1.

As between claim 1 and the Sallberg reference, the Applicant submits that independent claims 12 and 23 contains limitations analogous to those found in claim 1. For the above given reasons the Applicant respectfully submits that claims 12 and 23 contain the same limitations and as claim 1 and are also allowable over the Sallberg reference. The Applicant respectfully submits that claims 2, 4, 6-10, 13,15, 17-21 and 23-26 are dependent upon their respective independent claims and are allowable for similar reasons. This being the case, the Applicant respectfully requests withdrawal of the rejection of these claims.

Claim Rejections – 35 U.S.C. § 103 (a)

Claims 5, 11, 16 and 22 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Sallberg in view of Nevo, et al. (US 6,320,873 B1 hereinafter Nevo). The Applicant respectfully traverses the rejection of these claims. The Examiner's consideration of the amended claims is respectfully requested.

Statement of Common Ownership

The present application and the Sallberg reference were, at the time of the invention of the present application, owned by, or subject to, an obligation of assignment to Telefonaktiebolaget LM Ericsson, a Swedish corporation. Because Sallberg is disqualified as prior art, a 103 rejection of the above claims is not proper. The Applicant respectfully requests that the rejection of claims 5, 11, 16 and 22 be withdrawn.

Appl. No. 09/730,877
Amdt. Dated August 13, 2004
Reply to Office action of May 19, 2004
Attorney Docket No. P08915-US2
EUS/J/P/04-3189

CONCLUSION

In view of the foregoing remarks, the Applicant believes all of the claims currently pending in the Application to be in a condition for allowance. The Applicant, therefore, respectfully requests that the Examiner withdraw all rejections and issue a Notice of Allowance for all pending claims.

The Applicant requests a telephonic interview if the Examiner has any questions or requires any additional information that would further or expedite the prosecution of the Application.

Respectfully submitted,



By Sidney L. Weatherford
Registration No. 45,602

Date: August 13, 2004

Ericsson Inc.
6300 Legacy Drive, M/S EVR 1-C-11
Plano, Texas 75024
(972) 583-8656
sidney.weatherford@ericsson.com